arXiv:1402.2734v1 [stat.ME] 12 Feb 2014

A Graph-Based Multivariate Conditional Autoregressive Model

Ye Liang
Department of Statistics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078, U.S.A.
ye.liang@okstate.edu

Abstract

The conditional autoregressive model is one of the routines for applications with univariate areal data. However, many authors have shown that it is not trivial to extend the univariate specification to multivariate situations. The difficulties lie in many aspects, including validity, interpretability, flexibility and computational feasibility. We approach this problem from an element-based perspective which utilizes given graphical information and builds joint adjacency structures. Our framework is general but three special specifications are discussed in details with Bayesian computations, all of which are related to existing models in literature. We provide an example with public health data, not only to illustrate the implementation, but also to compare these specifications.

Keywords: Bayesian analysis; Disease mapping; Graphical model; G-Wishart distribution; Markov random field; Multivariate areal data.

1 Introduction

Areal data, sometimes called lattice data, are usually represented by an undirected graph where each vertex represents an areal unit and each edge represents a neighboring relationship. A finite set of random variables on an undirected graph, where each vertex is a random variable, is called a Markov random field if it has a Markov property. Hence, one often considers areal data as a Markov random field. The univariate conditional autoregressive (CAR) model originated from Besag (1974) is a Gaussian Markov random field model, for which the joint distribution is multivariate Gaussian. Let $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, \ldots, u_I)^T$ be a vector of random variables on I areal units (i.e. I vertices). The zero-centered conditional autoregressive model specifies full conditional Gaussian distributions

$$u_i \mid u_{-i} \sim \mathrm{N}\left(\sum_{i' \neq i} b_{ii'} u_{i'}, \tau_i^2\right), \quad i = 1, \ldots, I,$$

where u_{-i} is the collection of $u_{i',i'\neq i}$. Its resulting joint distribution, by the Brook's lemma, has a density form

$$f(\boldsymbol{u} \mid \boldsymbol{T}_{\text{CAR}}, \boldsymbol{B}_{\text{CAR}}) \propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{u}^T\boldsymbol{T}_{\text{CAR}}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{B}_{\text{CAR}})\boldsymbol{u}\right\},$$

where $\boldsymbol{I}$ is an identity matrix; $\boldsymbol{B}_{\text{CAR}}$ is the $I \times I$ matrix with off-diagonal entries $b_{ii'}$ and diagonal entries zero and $\boldsymbol{T}_{\text{CAR}} = \text{diag}\{\tau_1^2, \ldots, \tau_I^2\}$. The joint distribution is multivariate Gaussian if and only if $\boldsymbol{T}_{\text{CAR}}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{B}_{\text{CAR}})$ is symmetric and positive definite. A proper parameterization on $\boldsymbol{B}_{\text{CAR}}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}_{\text{CAR}}$ is needed. Consider a so-called adjacency matrix $\boldsymbol{C}_{\text{CAR}}$ for the undirected graph, where the ii'th entry $C_{ii'} = 1$ if unit i and unit i' are neighbors (denoted as $i \sim i'$) and $C_{ii'} = 0$ otherwise. One popular parameterization is to let $b_{ii'} = \rho C_{ii'}/C_{i+}$ and $\tau_i^2 = \sigma^2/C_{i+}$, where C_{i+} is the ith row sum of $\boldsymbol{C}_{\text{CAR}}$, representing the total number of neighbors of unit i. Let $\boldsymbol{D}_{\text{CAR}} = \text{diag}\{C_{1+}, \ldots, C_{I+}\}$. When ρ is strictly between the smallest and largest eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{D}_{\text{CAR}}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{C}_{\text{CAR}}\boldsymbol{D}_{\text{CAR}}^{-1/2}$ (or sufficiently $|\rho| < 1$) and $\sigma^2 > 0$, the joint distribution of $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a zero-mean multivariate Gaussian distribution with a covariance matrix $\sigma^2(\boldsymbol{D}_{\text{CAR}} - \rho\boldsymbol{C}_{\text{CAR}})^{-1}$. This is called the proper conditional autoregressive model. When $\rho = 1$, it is called the intrinsic conditional autoregressive model which is improper.

Turning to the multivariate situation, consider J responses (e.g. multiple diseases) on I areal units. Let $\boldsymbol{U}$ be an $I \times J$ matrix-variate where the ijth entry u_{ij} is a random variable for the ith areal unit and jth response. Each column of $\boldsymbol{U}$ is an areal vector for a single response and hence can be modeled by the univariate conditional autoregressive model. However, a multivariate model is desired for the matrix-variate $\boldsymbol{U}$ in order to simultaneously model the dependence across responses and areal units. Initially proposed by Mardia (1988), the multivariate conditional autoregressive model specifies full conditional distributions on row vectors of $\boldsymbol{U}$. Let $\boldsymbol{u}_i$ be the ith row vector of $\boldsymbol{U}$. In the spirit of Besag (1974), specify

$$\boldsymbol{u}_i \mid \boldsymbol{u}_{-i} \sim \text{N}\left(\sum_{i'\neq i}\boldsymbol{B}_{ii'}\boldsymbol{u}_{i'}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i\right), \quad i = 1, \ldots, I, \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{B}_{ii'}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$ are $J \times J$ matrices needing a further parameterization. To make the joint distribution for $\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{U}^T)$ a multivariate Gaussian, $\boldsymbol{B}_{ii'}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$ must satisfy certain conditions (Mardia, 1988). Gelfand and Vounatsou (2003) showed a convenient parameterization, $\boldsymbol{B}_{ii'} = (\rho C_{ii'}/C_{i+})\boldsymbol{I}_J$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}/C_{i+}$. When $|\rho| < 1$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is positive definite, $\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{U}^T)$ has a zero-mean multivariate Gaussian distribution with a covariance matrix $(\boldsymbol{D}_{\text{CAR}} - \rho\boldsymbol{C}_{\text{CAR}})^{-1} \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. It is clear that this multivariate specification is a Kronecker product

formula where $(\boldsymbol{D}_{\text{CAR}} - \rho \boldsymbol{C}_{\text{CAR}})^{-1}$ models the covariance structure across rows of $\boldsymbol{U}$ (spatial domain) and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ models the covariance structure across columns of $\boldsymbol{U}$ (response domain).

From the modeling perspective, Mardia's specification has a difficulty with parameterization. It is usually difficult to have a meaningful parameterization for $\boldsymbol{B}_{ii'}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$ unless one pursues a simple formulation. On the other hand, when we have graphical knowledge about the J responses, it is also difficult to incorporate this information directly. It is arguable that Mardia's specification presents a disconnect: the between vector variation is specified through a precision structure (the conditional autoregressive model) but the within vector variation is specified through a conditional covariance structure ($\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i$). To remedy this disconnect, one shall consider either the whole covariance structure or the whole precision structure. In this paper, we investigate the latter case as it is a natural extension of the univariate conditional autoregressive model and is particularly useful when graphical information is available.

We shall point out other recent work on multivariate conditional autoregressive models. Kim et al. (2001) developed a twofold model for the bivariate situation and Jin et al. (2005) introduced a conditional specification also for the bivariate situation. Multivariate situations were considered by Gelfand and Vounatsou (2003), Jin et al. (2007), MacNab (2011), Martinez-Beneito (2013) and many others. We will show the connection between our framework and some of these earlier work. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is our general framework and three special specifications. We present a real example with public health data in Section 3. Section 4 is a closing section with discussions.

2 A Graph-Based Model

2.1 General framework

Instead of specifying full conditional distributions on vectors like (1), we approach this problem from an element-based perspective which seems more natural. This consideration also appeared in (Sain et al., 2011). In the spirit of Besag (1974), specify full conditional distributions for each element u_{ij} in the matrix-variate $\boldsymbol{U}$,

$$u_{ij} \mid u_{-\{ij\}} \sim \text{N}\left(\sum_{\{i'j'\} \neq \{ij\}} b_{\{ij\},\{i'j'\}} u_{i'j'}, \tau_{ij}^2 \right), \quad i = 1, \ldots, I \text{ and } j = 1, \ldots, J,$$

where $\{i'j'\} \neq \{ij\}$ means either $i' \neq i$ or $j' \neq j$. In fact, here all elements in $\boldsymbol{U}$ form a lattice system. By the Brook's lemma, the resulting joint distribution for vec($\boldsymbol{U}$) has a

density form

$$f(\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{U}) \mid \boldsymbol{B}, \boldsymbol{T}) \propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{U})^T \boldsymbol{T}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{B})\,\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{U})\right\},$$

where $\boldsymbol{I}$ is an $IJ \times IJ$ identity matrix, $\boldsymbol{T} = \mathrm{diag}\{\tau_{11}^2, \ldots, \tau_{I1}^2, \ldots, \tau_{1J}^2, \ldots, \tau_{IJ}^2\}$ and $\boldsymbol{B}$ can be expressed block-wisely,

$$\boldsymbol{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{B}_{11} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{B}_{1J} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{B}_{J1} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{B}_{JJ} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{where} \quad \boldsymbol{B}_{jj'} = \begin{pmatrix} b_{\{1j\},\{1j'\}} & \cdots & b_{\{1j\},\{Ij'\}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{\{Ij\},\{1j'\}} & \cdots & b_{\{Ij\},\{Ij'\}} \end{pmatrix},$$

and the diagonal elements $b_{\{ij\},\{ij\}}$ are zero. The joint distribution for $\mathrm{vec}(\boldsymbol{U})$ is multivariate Gaussian if and only if $\boldsymbol{T}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{B})$ is symmetric and positive definite. It is desired that $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}$ are parameterized. We denote this general model $\mathrm{MCAR}(\boldsymbol{B}, \boldsymbol{T})$ for later use.

Consider the adjacency structure of the undirected graph for $\boldsymbol{U}$. In the univariate situation, the adjacency structure is naturally determined by the spatial map. Two areal units are connected by an edge if they are neighbors geographically. However, it is not quite obvious that which elements should be neighbors in $\boldsymbol{U}$, which makes the topic somewhat subjective. Consider a situation in which there is an undirected graph for the J responses. Let $\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}$ be the adjacency matrix for all areal units and $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}$ be the adjacency matrix for all responses. Both spatial graph and response graph are then uniquely determined by $\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}$, respectively. Let $\boldsymbol{C}$ be the joint adjacency matrix for the lattice system $\boldsymbol{U}$. A general construction of $\boldsymbol{C}$ can be made through $\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}$,

$$\boldsymbol{C} = \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)} \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} + \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)} \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I + \boldsymbol{I}_J \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}. \tag{2}$$

This construction connects u_{ij} with $u_{i'\sim i,j}$, $u_{i,j'\sim j}$ and $u_{i'\sim i,j'\sim j}$, meaning its spatial neighbor, response neighbor and interaction neighbor, respectively. One may add edges for secondary neighbors or drop edges when needed. For example, some other special constructions would be: (i) $\boldsymbol{C} = \boldsymbol{I}_J \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}$ (independent conditional autoregressive models, no dependence between responses); (ii) $\boldsymbol{C} = \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)} \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I$ (independent multivariate variables, no spatial dependence); (iii) $\boldsymbol{C} = \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)} \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I + \boldsymbol{I}_J \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}$ (drop edges with the interaction neighbor $u_{i'\sim i,j'\sim j}$). The construction (2) here is analogous to the concept of separability in spatio-temporal modeling, implying that the structure of the overall lattice system can be separated. We will focus on (2) throughout this paper though other constructions are possible.

Let $C_{\{ij\},\{i'j'\}}$ denote entries of $\boldsymbol{C}$, analogous to the block-wise notation $b_{\{ij\},\{i'j'\}}$ for $\boldsymbol{B}$. Let $d_j^{(r)}$ be the jth row sum in $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}$ and $d_i^{(s)}$ be the ith row sum in $\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}$. Then the ijth row sum

in $\boldsymbol{C}$ is $d_{ij} = d_j^{(r)} d_i^{(s)} + d_j^{(r)} + d_i^{(s)}$. Let $\boldsymbol{D}^{(r)} = \mathrm{diag}\{d_1^{(r)}, \ldots, d_J^{(r)}\}$, $\boldsymbol{D}^{(s)} = \mathrm{diag}\{d_1^{(s)}, \ldots, d_I^{(s)}\}$ and $\boldsymbol{D} = \mathrm{diag}\{d_{11}, \ldots, d_{I1}, \ldots, d_{1J}, \ldots, d_{IJ}\}$. Parameterization of $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}$ can be made on the basis of the joint adjacency structure. We mainly discuss three specifications in following subsections, all of which are related to existing models in literature.

2.2 Model 1: multifold specification with different linkage parameters

Kim et al. (2001) developed a twofold conditional autoregressive model for bivariate areal data ($J = 2$), using different linkage parameters for different types of neighbor. Those linkage parameters, in their work, are called smoothing and bridging parameters, representing the strength of information sharing. If we extend their specification to an arbitrary J, we can parameterize $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}$ in the following way (assuming $i \neq i'$ and $j \neq j'$):

$$b_{\{ij\},\{i'j\}} = \frac{\lambda_j}{d_{ij}} C_{\{ij\},\{i'j\}}, \quad b_{\{ij\},\{ij'\}} = \frac{\psi_{jj'}}{d_{ij}} \sqrt{\frac{\delta_j}{\delta_{j'}}} C_{\{ij\},\{ij'\}},$$

$$b_{\{ij\},\{i'j'\}} = \frac{\phi_{jj'}}{d_{ij}} \sqrt{\frac{\delta_j}{\delta_{j'}}} C_{\{ij\},\{i'j'\}}, \quad \tau_{ij}^2 = \frac{\delta_j}{d_{ij}},$$

where λ_j, $\psi_{jj'}$ and $\phi_{jj'}$ are linkage parameters and δ_j are variance components. Linkage parameters are for three types of neighbor: $u_{i'\sim i,j}$, $u_{i,j'\sim j}$ and $u_{i'\sim i,j'\sim j}$. Having this specification, the conditional mean of u_{ij} essentially is

$$\mathrm{E}(u_{ij} \mid u_{-\{ij\}}) = \frac{1}{d_{ij}} \left(\lambda_j \sum_{i'\sim i} u_{i'j} + \psi_{jj'} \sum_{j'\sim j} \sqrt{\frac{\delta_j}{\delta_{j'}}} u_{ij'} + \phi_{jj'} \sum_{i'\sim i} \sum_{j'\sim j} \sqrt{\frac{\delta_j}{\delta_{j'}}} u_{i'j'} \right),$$

which is a weighted average of all its neighbors in $\boldsymbol{C}$. This specification generalizes Kim et al. (2001)' twofold model and hence could be called a multifold specification. It can be shown that, for this parameterization, the joint precision matrix is

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{T}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{B}) &= (\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I) \left\{ \boldsymbol{D} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\boldsymbol{\Psi} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I - (\boldsymbol{\Phi} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} \right\} (\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Delta} = \mathrm{diag}\{\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_J\}$, $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \mathrm{diag}\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_J\}$, $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$ are $J \times J$ symmetric matrices with entries $\psi_{jj'}$ and $\phi_{jj'}$, respectively, and the operator $\circ$ means an element-wise product. Derivation of (3) is given in Appendix 1. Note that only nonzero entries of $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$ are parameters in the model, the number of which depends on $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}$. Jin et al. (2007) mentioned

a "dependent non-identical latent spatial process" which is also a special case of Model 1 when $\boldsymbol{C} = \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)} \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} + \boldsymbol{I}_J \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}$, implying that $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ is zero.

In order to make (3) positive definite, constraints on λ_j, $\psi_{jj'}$ and $\phi_{jj'}$ are needed, with $\delta_j > 0$ assumed. In general, it is difficult to find a sufficient and necessary condition for the positive definiteness of (3). Even such a condition on λ_j, $\psi_{jj'}$ and $\phi_{jj'}$ can be found, computational difficulties are expected in the inference procedure. Kim et al. (2001)'s solution to this problem was a sufficient condition: $\max\{|\lambda_j|, |\psi_{jj'}|, |\phi_{jj'}|; \forall j, j'\} < 1$. The matrix (3) under this condition is diagonally dominant and hence is positive definite. Though their proof was under $J = 2$, it is generally true for any J (by the same argument). The advantage of this condition is that it is simple and implementable. However, this is not a necessary condition meaning that it is impossible to reach all possible positive definite structures for the model under such condition. We expect this to be a major deficiency of the multifold model and further evidences can be found in Section 3. We adopt this solution for now due to lack of better solutions.

In a Bayesian model, priors on parameters λ_j, $\psi_{jj'}$ and $\phi_{jj'}$ can be chosen based on their actual constraints. In our case, a uniform prior $\text{Unif}(-1, 1)$ is adequate for these linkage parameters. Priors on the variance components δ_j can be weakly-informative inverse-gamma priors $\text{IG}(a_j, b_j)$. Computational details are discussed in Appendix 2.

2.3 Model 2: completely separable specification with homogeneous spatial smoothing

Gelfand and Vounatsou (2003)'s Kronecker-product model is a convenient parameterization of Mardia (1988)'s model. In our framework, this specification can be achieved and extended by having the following parameterization for $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}$ (assuming $i \neq i'$ and $j \neq j'$):

$$b_{\{ij\},\{i'j\}} = \frac{\rho}{d_i^{(s)}} C_{\{ij\},\{i'j\}}, \quad b_{\{ij\},\{ij'\}} = -\frac{\omega_{jj'}}{\omega_{jj}} C_{\{ij\},\{ij'\}},$$
$$b_{\{ij\},\{i'j'\}} = \frac{\rho\omega_{jj'}}{d_i^{(s)}\omega_{jj}} C_{\{ij\},\{i'j'\}}, \quad \tau_{ij}^2 = \frac{1}{d_i^{(s)}\omega_{jj}},$$

where ρ and $\omega_{jj'}$ are linkage parameters, and $1/\omega_{jj}$ are variance components. This parameterization is not very straightforward at first glance, but is much clearer in the form of conditional mean:

$$\text{E}\left(u_{ij} - \frac{\rho}{d_i^{(s)}} \sum_{i' \sim i} u_{i'j} \;\middle|\; u_{-\{ij\}} \right) = -\sum_{j' \sim j} \frac{\omega_{jj'}}{\omega_{jj}} \left(u_{ij'} - \frac{\rho}{d_i^{(s)}} \sum_{i' \sim i} u_{i'j'} \right). \tag{4}$$

Note that for a single response, the univariate conditional autoregressive model specifies $\mathrm{E}(u_i|u_{-i}) = \rho \sum_{i' \sim i} u_{i'}/d_i^{(s)}$. In the multivariate setting, $\rho \sum_{i' \sim i} u_{i'j}/d_i^{(s)}$ is no longer the conditional mean for $u_{ij} \mid u_{-\{ij\}}$ and their conditional difference is regressed on other differences through $\omega_{jj'}$. This parameterization yields the joint precision matrix

$$\boldsymbol{T}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{B}) = \left\{\boldsymbol{\Omega} \circ (\boldsymbol{I}_J + \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})\right\} \otimes (\boldsymbol{D}^{(s)} - \rho \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}), \tag{5}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ is a symmetric $J \times J$ matrix with entries $\omega_{jj'}$. Derivation of (5) is given in Appendix 1. The linkage parameter ρ is interpreted as a spatial smoothing parameter and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ controls dependence across J responses. It is noteworthy that only nonzero entries in $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ are parameters in the model and we denote $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} = \boldsymbol{\Omega} \circ (\boldsymbol{I}_J + \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})$ for simplicity. The notation $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$, commonly used in graphical models, means the precision matrix for a graph $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}$. The model (5) is a natural extension of Gelfand and Vounatsou (2003)'s model. When $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}$ is the complete graph (any two vertices are connected), $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$ is free of zero entries. Then let $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-1}$ and (5) is equivalent to Gelfand and Vounatsou (2003)'s specification. We call this a completely separable specification because the Kronecker product completely separates the spatial domain and the response domain. This complete separation is often not desirable because it makes the spatial smoothing common for all j. We call this homogeneous spatial smoothing because the linkage ρ is the same for any i and i' which distinguishes Model 2 from Model 3. The limitation of this model is apparently its inflexibility due to the common linkage ρ.

The joint precision matrix (5) is positive definite if $|\rho| < 1$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$ is positive definite. In a Bayesian model, an appropriate prior on the graphical precision matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$ is desired. A reasonable choice is the G-Wishart distribution (Atay-Kayis and Massam, 2005; Letac and Massam, 2007). The G-Wishart distribution is a conjugate family for the precision matrix on a Gaussian graphical model, whose density function for $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$ is given by

$$p(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \mid b, \boldsymbol{V}) = I_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}(b, \boldsymbol{V})^{-1} \left|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}\right|^{\frac{b-2}{2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}(\boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}})\right\} 1_{\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \in M^+(\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})},$$

where $b > 2$ is the number of degrees of freedom; $\boldsymbol{V}$ is the scale matrix, analogous to the regular Wishart distribution; $I_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}(\cdot)$ is the normalizing constant and $M^+(\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})$ is the cone of possible symmetric positive definite precision matrices on the graph $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}$. The requirement of positive definiteness is naturally satisfied by using this G-Wishart distribution. It is also practically attractive because of its conjugacy. That said, for a prior distribution $\mathrm{GWis}(b, \boldsymbol{V})$ and a given sample covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{S}$ of sample size n, the posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$ is $\mathrm{GWis}(b + n, \boldsymbol{V} + \boldsymbol{S})$. Computational details are given in Appendix 2.

2.4 Model 3: completely separable specification with heterogenous spatial smoothing

Dobra et al. (2011) introduced a multivariate lattice model by giving Kronecker product G-Wishart priors to the matrix-variate $\boldsymbol{U}$. In our framework, $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}$ can be parameterized in the following way (assuming $i \neq i'$ and $j \neq j'$):

$$b_{\{ij\},\{i'j\}} = -\frac{\omega^{(s)}_{ii'}}{\omega^{(s)}_{ii}} C_{\{ij\},\{i'j\}}, \quad b_{\{ij\},\{ij'\}} = -\frac{\omega^{(r)}_{jj'}}{\omega^{(r)}_{jj}} C_{\{ij\},\{ij'\}},$$
$$b_{\{ij\},\{i'j'\}} = -\frac{\omega^{(s)}_{ii'}\omega^{(r)}_{jj'}}{\omega^{(s)}_{ii}\omega^{(r)}_{jj}} C_{\{ij\},\{i'j'\}}, \quad \tau^2_{ij} = \frac{1}{\omega^{(s)}_{ii}\omega^{(r)}_{jj}},$$

which is equivalent to the version of conditional mean

$$\mathrm{E}\left(u_{ij} - \frac{1}{\omega^{(s)}_{ii}} \sum_{i' \sim i} \omega^{(s)}_{ii'} u_{i'j} \;\middle|\; u_{-\{ij\}} \right) = -\sum_{j' \sim j} \frac{\omega_{jj'}}{\omega_{jj}} \left(u_{ij'} - \frac{1}{\omega^{(s)}_{ii}} \sum_{i' \sim i} \omega^{(s)}_{ii'} u_{i'j'} \right). \tag{6}$$

Comparing (6) with (4), instead of a homogeneous spatial smoothing with ρ, we make it heterogeneous with $\omega^{(s)}_{ii'}$ for different i and i'. This treatment makes the model more flexible in the spatial domain. The resulting joint precision matrix for this specification is

$$\boldsymbol{T}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{B}) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)} \circ (\boldsymbol{I}_J + \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) \right\} \otimes \left\{ \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)} \circ (\boldsymbol{I}_I + \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}) \right\}, \tag{7}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)}$ is a symmetric $J \times J$ matrix with entries $\omega^{(r)}_{jj'}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)}$ is a symmetric $I \times I$ matrix with entries $\omega^{(s)}_{ii'}$. Derivation of (7) is given in Appendix 1. We let $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)} \circ (\boldsymbol{I}_J + \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)} \circ (\boldsymbol{I}_I + \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)})$ for simplicity. Again, we can see the difference between (7) and (5). In model (5), the spatial part is the conventional conditional autoregressive model while in model (7), it is modeled by $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}}$. Dobra et al. (2011) showed that the G-Wishart prior for $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}}$ can contain the conventional version as a mode when b and $\boldsymbol{V}$ are properly specified.

The precision matrix (7) is positive definite if both $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}}$ are positive definite. In a Bayesian model, both can have G-Wishart priors. The specification has an obvious problem of identification: $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \otimes \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}} = z\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \otimes (1/z)\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}}$, where z is an arbitrary constant scalar. Following Wang and West (2009), we impose a constraint $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)},11} = 1$ and add an auxiliary variable z. Then specify a joint prior on $(z, z\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}})$:

$$p(z, z\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \mid b^{(r)}, \boldsymbol{V}^{(r)}) \propto p_{GWis}(z\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \mid b^{(r)}, \boldsymbol{V}^{(r)}) \cdot 1, \tag{8}$$

where $p_{GWis}(\cdot)$ is the density of G-Wishart distribution. Transform this joint density to $(z, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}})$ and we obtain the desired joint prior. Impose no constraint on $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}}$ and specify $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}} \sim \text{GWis}(b^{(s)}, \boldsymbol{V}^{(s)})$. Computational details are given in Appendix 2.

2.5 A brief summary of three models

All three models are based on the joint graph (2) and our general framework. They are all related to existing multivariate models. We do not discuss other specifications in this paper, but it is possible that there are better specifications under this framework. The joint precision matrix for Model 1, 2 and 3 are given by (3), (5) and (7), respectively. Constraints are imposed for all three models to ensure the positive definiteness of the joint precision matrix.

We now briefly compare all three models. Let function $\nu(\cdot)$ be the total number of vertices and edges in a graph. Model 1 specifies $\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{U}) \mid \delta_j, \lambda_j, \psi_{jj'}, \phi_{jj'},\ j \neq j'$. The total number of parameters in the model is $2\nu(\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})$, which depends on the response graph only. The constraints on parameters are $\max\{|\lambda_j|, |\psi_{jj'}|, |\phi_{jj'}|; \forall j, j'\} < 1$ and $\delta_j > 0$, for all j. Model 2 specifies $\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{U}) \mid \rho, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$ whose total number of parameters is $\nu(\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) + 1$, which depends on the response graph only. The constraints on parameters are $|\rho| < 1$ and that $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$ is positive definite. Model 3 specifies $\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{U}) \mid \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}}$ whose total number of parameters is $\nu(\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) + \nu(\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)})$, which depends on both the response graph and spatial graph. The constraints on parameters are that both $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}}$ are positive definite. It is clear that Model 2 has the least number of parameters for any $J > 1$ and $I > 1$ (trivially satisfied). Model 3 often has more parameters than Model 1 because the size of a spatial graph is often larger than a response graph. Not only can the complexity of the model affect the computational feasibility, but also affect most model selection scores (penalized by a model selection criteria). However, on the other hand, a more complicated model usually has greater flexibility. We will not give an ultimate recommendation on the three models because the question here is about a tradeoff. Model comparisons with real data are discussed in Section 3.

3 An Example in Multiple Disease Mapping

We present an example with public health data in Missouri. In particular, we analyze a county level dataset with five response variables, which implies that $I = 115$ and $J = 5$. Two of the response variables are survey counts in each county: y_{i1} (smoking) and y_{i2} (no

health care), which are collected from the 2011 Missouri County Level Survey Study. The other three response variables are mortality counts in each county: y_{i3} (lung cancer), y_{i4} (heart diseases) and y_{i5} (COPD), which are collected from the Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results (SEER) within a given time period. Let n_{i1} and n_{i2} be the numbers of respondents for the survey, and let E_{i3}, E_{i4} and E_{i5} be the age-adjusted expected numbers for the three diseases. Proportions $y_{ij}/n_{ij},\ j = 1, 2$ give empirical estimates of the prevalence and proportions $y_{ij}/E_{ij},\ j = 3, 4, 5$ give standardized mortality ratios.

We are now interested in jointly modeling all y_{ij} in a Bayesian hierarchical framework. We use the binomial-logit model and the Poisson-lognormal model (Banerjee et al., 2004) for $y_{i,1-2}$ and $y_{i,3-5}$, respectively, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} y_{ij} &\sim \text{Bin}(n_{ij}, p_{ij}), \quad \text{logit}(p_{ij}) = \beta_j + u_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, I \text{ and } j = 1, 2; \\ y_{ij} &\sim \text{Poi}(E_{ij}\eta_{ij}), \quad \log(\eta_{ij}) = \beta_j + u_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, I \text{ and } j = 3, 4, 5. \end{aligned}$$

Parameters p_{ij} are underlying binomial prevalences and parameters η_{ij} are underlying relative risks. In our example, no covariates are included and hence u_{ij} is interpreted as a spatial smoother. We specify a vague normal prior for β_j and three different MCAR($\boldsymbol{B}, \boldsymbol{T}$) for $\boldsymbol{U} = \{u_{ij}\}$. All computations for this model then follow Appendix 2.

Our discussion in this paper focuses on given response graphs though graph determination is possible with adjusted computation steps (Wang and Li, 2012; Dobra et al., 2011). To empirically determine the response graph for this example, we compute $r_{ij} = \text{logit}(y_{ij}/n_{ij}),\ j = 1, 2$ and $r_{ij} = \log(y_{ij}/E_{ij}).\ j = 3, 4, 5$. We treat r_{ij} as 115 independent multivariate normal samples for the five response variables (ignoring the spatial dependence). For this small five-variable problem, we use algorithms in Wang and Li (2012) to determine the graph and choose the one with the highest posterior probability. This empirically assumed response graph is shown in Figure 1, along with the actual spatial graph and the corresponding joint precision structure. Note that, under adjacency construction (2), this precision structure will be the same for all three models discussed before. We shall later compare this assumed graph with the complete graph which is indeed the traditional setting without graphical considerations. We do not claim that the empirically assumed graph is the "best" one but it would be convenient, with a given graph, to compare our proposed models.

In total we fitted six models (Model 1-3 versus two graphs) for the data and performed Markov chain Monte Carlo for 100,000 cycles with 50,000 burn-ins. Convergence and related issues have been carefully examined. We use the deviance information criterion (DIC) to compare all six models. Note that DIC = Dbar + pD, giving the posterior mean deviance penalized by the effective number of parameters. Since in this hierarchical model, usually



Figure 1: The assumed response graph ($J = 5$), spatial graph ($I = 115$) and structure of the corresponding joint precision matrix (575×575).

Table 1: DIC of six models

	Complete Graph $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}$			Assumed Graph $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}$		
	Dbar	pD	DIC	Dbar	pD	DIC
Model 1	4622.4	474.7	5097.1	4622.5	471.6	5094.1
Model 2	4615.4	462.0	5077.4	4598.8	457.9	5056.7
Model 3	4545.8	515.8	5061.6	4541.8	514.2	5055.9

the focus is underlying prevalences p_{ij} and relative risks η_{ij} which are mid-level parameters, DIC should be an appropriate measure for this type of comparisons (Spiegelhalter et al., 2002). Comparison results are reported in Table 1. When compare the complete graph with the assumed graph, the gain of considering a graphical structure is substantial even though the assumed graph may not be the "best" one. We are also interested in comparing our proposed three models. Clearly, Model 1 is much worse than the other two and the reason, however, has been mentioned in Section 2: the unnecessary positivity condition seriously limits the precision structures and the "true" structure may not be in this class. There is not much difference in DIC between Model 2 and 3, indicating that both models are equally preferable for the data. However, it is interesting to notice the huge difference in Dbar and pD. Model 3 is much more flexible than Model 2 in the spatial domain and hence fits the data better (smaller Dbar), but suffers from a large number of parameters (greater pD).

An intuitive way to see the dependence after modeling is to check posterior correlations of u_{ij}, as shown in Figure 3. We also empirically calculated correlations using r_{ij} for the five response variables (upper diagonal and by rows): $(0.07, 0.49, 0.31, 0.27)$, $(0.49, 0.35, 0.49)$, $(0.67, 0.74)$, (0.63). The block patterns in Figure 3 generally reflect the empirical correlations. It can be seen that Model 2 and Model 3 are similar while Model 1 is unsatisfactory. A map of posterior means of u_{ij} under Model 2 is shown in Figure 2 for illustration. A higher u_{ij} implies a higher prevalence or relative risk. Notice that the three disease mortalities have similar spatial patterns, and "smoking" and "no health care" seem to be positively correlated with those mortalities.



Figure 2: Posterior means of u_{ij} under Model 2 with the assume response graph.

4 Discussion

The three models discussed in this paper mainly follow the adjacency structure (2) which is constructed based on given response graph and spatial graph. We have already pointed out some other possible choices that are all "separable". Indeed, the adjacency matrix describes the neighboring structure of the joint graph. It could be determined to serve a particular need. For instance, consider a spatio-temporal modeling where the time domain determines the response graph. In this scenario, $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)} = \boldsymbol{C}^{(t)}$ could be a directed acyclic graph with pth order indicating a conditional dependence of $u_{it} \mid u_{i,t-1}, \ldots, u_{i,t-p}$. Note that $\boldsymbol{C}$ will be asymmetric and $\boldsymbol{B}$ will be asymmetric as well. The construction (2) could also be used if the dynamic process is separable, otherwise more complicated constructions can be considered, for instance, time-varying spatial structures.

Parameterization for $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}$ perhaps is the most challenging part for it is always associated with the positivity condition. Under an arbitrary parameterization, it is difficult to seek a suitable condition for the positive definiteness. As we have seen in Model 1, a sufficient condition seriously limits the richness of the precision structure, but a sufficient and necessary condition is not obvious. On the other hand, perhaps the Kronecker product structure is more straightforward and easier to deal with, i.e. a structure like $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)} \otimes \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)}$, because one only needs to ensure positive definite $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)}$ separately. However, the Kronecker product structure is not always satisfactory due to its inflexibility. One option is to decompose and modify both $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)}$ and maintain their positive definiteness (Gelfand and Vounatsou, 2003; Martinez-Beneito, 2013), but a meaningful interpretation might be lost. With a somewhat arbitrary parameterization, such as Model 1, we are curious about its performance under a suitable condition.

Appendix 1: Some Derivations

Derivation of equation (3)

With the parameterization in Model 1, we have $\boldsymbol{T} = \boldsymbol{D}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\Delta} \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I)$ and

$$\boldsymbol{B} = (\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I)\boldsymbol{D}^{-1} \left\{ \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} + (\boldsymbol{\Psi} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I + (\boldsymbol{\Phi} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} \right\} (\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I).$$

Then immediately we have expression (3) for $\boldsymbol{T}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{B})$.

Derivation of equation (5)

With the parameterization in Model 2, we have $\boldsymbol{T} = \left(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \otimes \boldsymbol{D}^{(s)}\right)^{-1}$ and

$$\boldsymbol{B} = \rho \boldsymbol{I}_J \otimes \boldsymbol{D}^{(s)-1}\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} - \left(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Omega} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}\right) \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I + \rho \left(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Omega} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}\right) \otimes \boldsymbol{D}^{(s)-1}\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{T}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{B}) &= \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \otimes \boldsymbol{D}^{(s)} - \rho\, \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} + (\boldsymbol{\Omega} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) \otimes \boldsymbol{D}^{(s)} - \rho(\boldsymbol{\Omega} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} \\
&= \left\{\boldsymbol{\Omega} \circ (\boldsymbol{I}_J + \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})\right\} \otimes \boldsymbol{D}^{(s)} - \left\{\boldsymbol{\Omega} \circ (\boldsymbol{I}_J + \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})\right\} \otimes \rho \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} \\
&= \left\{\boldsymbol{\Omega} \circ (\boldsymbol{I}_J + \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})\right\} \otimes (\boldsymbol{D}^{(s)} - \rho \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}),
\end{aligned}$$

which is expression (5).

Derivation of equation (7)

With the parameterization in Model 3, we have $\boldsymbol{T} = \left(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)}) \otimes \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)})\right)^{-1}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{B} &= -\boldsymbol{I}_J \otimes \left(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}\right) - \left(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}\right) \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I \\
&\quad - \left(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}\right) \otimes \left(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{T}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{B}) &= \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)}) \otimes \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)}) + \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)}) \otimes (\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}) \\
&\quad + (\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) \otimes \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)}) + (\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) \otimes (\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}) \\
&= \left\{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(r)} \circ (\boldsymbol{I}_J + \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})\right\} \otimes \left\{\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{(s)} \circ (\boldsymbol{I}_I + \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)})\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

which is expression (7).

Appendix 2: Bayesian Computations

An example of hierarchical model

For illustration, we now assume a full Bayesian hierarchical model and give computational details for this model. Assume binomial counts y_{ij}/n_{ij} for J responses and I areal units. Specify a Bayesian model as follows, for $i = 1, \ldots, I$ and $j = 1, \ldots, J$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&y_{ij} \mid p_{ij} \sim \text{Bin}(n_{ij}, p_{ij}), \qquad \text{logit}(p_{ij}) = \beta_j + u_{ij}, \\
&\beta_j \sim \text{N}(0, \tau_0^2), \qquad \boldsymbol{U} \mid \boldsymbol{B}, \boldsymbol{T} \sim \text{MCAR}(\boldsymbol{B}, \boldsymbol{T}),
\end{aligned}$$

where τ_0^2 is a given constant, $\boldsymbol{U}$ is the matrix-variate of u_{ij}, and priors for $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}$ depend on the specific parameterization. This section is organized as follows: we first discuss updating effects parameters β_j and u_{ij} and then discuss updating the parameterized $\boldsymbol{B}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}$ for Model 1, 2 and 3 separately.

Updating effect parameters and hierarchical centering

Our experience has shown that the convergence is poor if we directly update β_j and u_{ij}. We apply the hierarchical centering technique (Gelfand et al., 1995) and block sampling, which work well in our practice. Let $\gamma_{ij} = \beta_j + u_{ij}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \text{vec}[(\gamma_{ij})_{I\times J}]$ has a non-centered MCAR prior. We update (γ_{ij}, β_j) instead of (u_{ij}, β_j). The full conditional distribution of γ_{ij} is

$$p(\gamma_{ij} \mid \cdot) \propto \frac{e^{y_{ij}\gamma_{ij}}}{(1+e^{\gamma_{ij}})^{n_{ij}}} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2\tau_{ij}^2}\left(\gamma_{ij} - \beta_j - \sum_{\{i'j'\}\neq\{ij\}} b_{\{ij\},\{i'j'\}}(\gamma_{i'j'} - \beta_{j'}) \right) \right\}.$$

We use Metropolis-Hastings algorithm to sample γ_{ij} from this conditional density. We block sample $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in the following way. For now denote $\boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{T}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{B})$, the joint precision matrix. Let $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^* = \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{**}$ be a $J \times 1$ "collapsed" vector of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*$: γ_1^{**} is the sum of the first I elements in $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*$, γ_2^{**} is the sum of the second I elements in $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^*$ and so on. Partition $\boldsymbol{A}$ into $J \times J$ blocks and define matrix $\boldsymbol{H}$ which is the "collapsed" $\boldsymbol{A}$:

$$\boldsymbol{H} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}^T\boldsymbol{A}_{11}\mathbf{1} & \cdots & \mathbf{1}^T\boldsymbol{A}_{1J}\mathbf{1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{1}^T\boldsymbol{A}_{J1}\mathbf{1} & \cdots & \mathbf{1}^T\boldsymbol{A}_{JJ}\mathbf{1}, \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the all-one vector. Then the full conditional distribution for the vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is

$$(\boldsymbol{\beta} \mid \cdot) \sim \text{N}\left[(\boldsymbol{H} + 1/\tau_0^2\boldsymbol{I})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{**}, (\boldsymbol{H} + 1/\tau_0^2\boldsymbol{I})^{-1} \right].$$

Model 1: updating δ_j, λ_j, $\psi_{jj'}$ and $\phi_{jj'}$

Recall priors on these parameters: $\delta_j \sim \text{IG}(a_j, b_j)$ and $\lambda_j, \psi_{jj'}, \phi_{jj'} \sim \text{Unif}(-1, 1)$. Let $\boldsymbol{u}_j$ be the jth column vector of $\boldsymbol{U}$, $j = 1, \ldots, J$ and $\boldsymbol{D}_j$ be the jth diagonal block of $\boldsymbol{D}$. The full conditional distribution of δ_j is given by

$$p(\delta_j \mid \cdot) \propto \delta_j^{-\frac{I}{2}-a_j-1} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2\delta_j}\boldsymbol{u}_j^T(\boldsymbol{D}_j - \lambda_j\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)})\boldsymbol{u}_j + \sum_{j'\sim j} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta_j\delta_{j'}}}\boldsymbol{u}_j^T(\psi_{jj'}\boldsymbol{I}_I + \phi_{jj'}\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)})\boldsymbol{u}_{j'} - \frac{b_j}{\delta_j} \right\}.$$

It can be shown that the transformed one $(\sqrt{1/\delta_j} \mid \cdot)$ is log-concave when $I + 2a_j - 1 > 0$ (trivially satisfied). Thus, we use the adaptive rejection sampling (ARS) to update δ_j.

Let $\boldsymbol{W}$ be an $I \times J$ matrix, where $\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{W}) = (\boldsymbol{\Delta}^{-1/2} \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I)\,\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{U})$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_j$ be the jth column vector of $\boldsymbol{W}$. Let $\boldsymbol{M} = \boldsymbol{D} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} - (\boldsymbol{\Psi} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I - (\boldsymbol{\Phi} \circ \boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}) \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}$ as in (3). Then λ_j, $\psi_{jj'}$ and $\phi_{jj'}$ are sequentially updated through following full conditional distributions,

$$\begin{aligned} p(\lambda_j \mid \cdot) &\propto |\boldsymbol{M}(\lambda_j)|^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\lambda_j \boldsymbol{w}_j^T \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} \boldsymbol{w}_j\right), \\ p(\psi_{jj'} \mid \cdot) &\propto |\boldsymbol{M}(\psi_{jj'})|^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(\psi_{jj'} \boldsymbol{w}_j^T \boldsymbol{w}_{j'}\right), \\ p(\phi_{jj'} \mid \cdot) &\propto |\boldsymbol{M}(\phi_{jj'})|^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(\phi_{jj'} \boldsymbol{w}_j^T \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)} \boldsymbol{w}_{j'}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We use Metropolis-Hastings algorithm to update these parameters. Note that evaluating $|\boldsymbol{M}|$ could be computationally intensive because of its large dimension. However, $\boldsymbol{M}$ could often be sparse because it is a construction from $\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}$ and $\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}$. An efficient algorithm, usually based on the Cholesky decomposition, on sparse matrices is helpful in reducing the computation time. We recommend the R package "spam" (Furrer and Sain, 2010) for R users.

Model 2: updating ρ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$

Recall priors on these parameters: $\rho \sim U(-1, 1)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \sim \text{GWis}(b, \boldsymbol{V})$. Use Metropolis-Hastings algorithm to update ρ. It can be shown that the full conditional distribution for ρ is

$$p(\rho \mid \cdot) \propto \left|\boldsymbol{D}^{(s)} - \rho \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}\right|^{\frac{J}{2}} \exp\left\{\frac{\rho}{2}\,\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{U})^T (\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \otimes \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)})\,\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{U})\right\}.$$

Efficiency of evaluating $\left|\boldsymbol{D}^{(s)} - \rho \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}\right|$ depends on the sparsity of the matrix.

Let $\boldsymbol{W}_1$ be an $I \times J$ matrix, where $\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{W}_1) = [\boldsymbol{I}_J \otimes (\boldsymbol{D}^{(s)} - \rho \boldsymbol{C}^{(s)})^{1/2}]\,\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{U})$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_{1,j}$ be the jth column vector of $\boldsymbol{W}_1$. Let $\boldsymbol{S}$ be an $J \times J$ matrix with $s_{jj'} = \boldsymbol{w}_{1,j}^T \boldsymbol{w}_{1,j'}$. Then the full conditional distribution of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$ is

$$p(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \mid \cdot) \propto |\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}|^{\frac{b+I-2}{2}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} tr\left\{\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} (\boldsymbol{V} + \boldsymbol{S})\right\}\right] 1_{\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \in M^+(\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})},$$

which is $\text{GWis}(b + I, \boldsymbol{V} + \boldsymbol{S})$. For sampling from the G-Wishart distribution, we use the block Gibbs sampler (given the set of maximum cliques) by Wang and Li (2012).

Model 3: updating $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}}$

Recall that we impose a constraint and use a joint prior (8) on $(z, z\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}})$ and have $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}} \sim \text{GWis}(b^{(s)}, \boldsymbol{V}^{(s)})$. Let both $\boldsymbol{W}^{(r)}$ and $\boldsymbol{W}^{(s)}$ be $I \times J$ matrices, where $\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{W}^{(r)}) = (\boldsymbol{I}_J \otimes \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}})\,\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{U})$ and $\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{W}^{(s)}) = (\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{1/2}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \otimes \boldsymbol{I}_I)\,\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{U})$. Let $\boldsymbol{w}_j^{(r)}$ be the jth column vector of $\boldsymbol{W}^{(r)}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_i^{(s)}$ be the ith row vector of $\boldsymbol{W}^{(s)}$. Then let $\boldsymbol{S}^{(r)}$ be $J \times J$ with $s^{(r)}_{jj'} = \boldsymbol{w}_j^{(r)T}\boldsymbol{w}_j^{(r)}$ and $\boldsymbol{S}^{(s)}$ be $I \times I$ with $s^{(s)}_{ii'} = \boldsymbol{w}_i^{(s)T}\boldsymbol{w}_i^{(s)}$. With these notations, we have

$$(z \mid \cdot) \sim Ga(a_z, b_z),$$

where $a_z = J(b-2)/2 + \nu(\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)})$ and $b_z = tr(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}}\boldsymbol{V}^{(r)})/2$;

$$(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(r)}} \mid \cdot) \sim \text{GWis}(b^{(r)} + I, z\boldsymbol{V}^{(r)} + \boldsymbol{S}^{(r)})$$

and

$$(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\boldsymbol{C}^{(s)}} \mid \cdot) \sim \text{GWis}(b^{(s)} + J, \boldsymbol{V}^{(s)} + \boldsymbol{S}^{(s)}).$$

References

Atay-Kayis, A. and Massam, H. (2005), 'A Monte Carlo method for computing the marginal likelihood in nondecomposable Gaussian graphical models', *Biometrika* **92**, 317–335.

Banerjee, S., Gelfand, A. and Carlin, B. (2004), *Hierarchical modeling and analysis for spatial data*, CRC Press/Chapman & Hall.

Besag, J. (1974), 'Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B* **36**, 192–236.

Dobra, A., A., L. and Rodriguez, A. (2011), 'Bayesian inference for general Gaussian graphical models with applications to multivariate lattice data', *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **106**, 1418–1433.

Furrer, R. and Sain, S. (2010), 'spam: A sparse matrix R package with emphasis on MCMC methods for Gaussian Markov random fields', *Journal of Statistical Software* **36**, 1–25.

Gelfand, A., Sahu, S. and Carlin, B. (1995), 'Efficient parameterizations for normal linear mixed models', *Biometrika* **82**, 479–488.

Gelfand, A. and Vounatsou, P. (2003), 'Proper multivariate conditional autoregressive models for spatial data analysis', *Biostatistics* **4**, 11–25.

Jin, X., Banerjee, S. and Carlin, B. (2007), 'Order-free co-regionalized areal data models with application to multiple-disease mapping', *Journal of Royal Statistical Society. Series B* **69**, 817–838.

Jin, X., Carlin, B. and Banerjee, S. (2005), 'Generalized hierarchical multivariate CAR models for areal data', *Biometrics* **61**, 950–961.

Kim, H., Sun, D. and Tsutakawa, R. (2001), 'A bivariate Bayes method for improving estimates of mortality rates with a twofold conditional autoregressive model', *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **96**, 1506–1521.

Letac, G. and Massam, H. (2007), 'Wishart distributions for decomposable graphs', *Annals of Statistics* **35**, 1278–1323.

MacNab, Y. (2011), 'On Gaussian Markov random fields and Bayesian disease mapping', *Statistical Methods in Medical Research* **20**, 49–68.

Mardia, K. (1988), 'Multidimentional multivariate Gaussian Markov random fields with application to image processing', *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **24**, 265–284.

Martinez-Beneito, M. (2013), 'A general modeling framework for multivariate disease mapping', *Biometrika* **100**, 539–553.

Sain, S., Furrer, R. and Cressie, N. (2011), 'A spatial analysis of multivariate output from regional climate models', *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **5**, 150–175.

Spiegelhalter, D., Best, N., Carlin, B. and van der Linde, A. (2002), 'Bayesian measures of model complexity and fit (with discussion)', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* **64**, 583–639.

Wang, H. and Li, S. (2012), 'Efficient Gaussian graphical model determination under G-Wishart prior distributions', *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **6**, 168–198.

Wang, H. and West, M. (2009), 'Bayesian analysis of matrix normal graphical models', *Biometrika* **96**, 821–834.

This figure "figure3.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arxiv.org/ps/1402.2734v1